

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,891	01/18/2002		Adi A. Scheidemann	UWOTL118604	1012
26389	7590	02/26/2004		EXAM	MINER
CHRISTEI 1420 FIFTH	•	CONNOR, JOHNS	KOHNER, MATTHEW J		
SUITE 2800				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE.	WA 981	01-2347		3653	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
4 ′	10/052,891	SCHEIDEMANN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Matthew J Kohner	3653					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum study period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 N</u>	lovember 2003.						
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicatority documents have been receiv out (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/052,891

Art Unit: 3653

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Preliminary Amendment and Remarks

Applicants have pointed out in the remarks accompanying the preliminary amendment that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection in the parent case (09/469,662) of the present case should be withdrawn.

The examiner has carefully reviewed the file histories of both applications:

- 09/325,926 (now Patent No. 6,182,831)
- 09/469,662 (divisional of 09/325,936).

Examiner agrees that a double patenting rejection cannot be sustained in this case. As applicant states, in regard to a divisional application, 35 USC 121 prohibits a double patenting rejection wherein the basis of the rejection is the issued patent of the parent case (provided the two cases were copending).

Response to Election

Applicant has cancelled claims 27-35. Therefore, claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

Application/Control Number: 10/052,891

Art Unit: 3653

the invention. Specifically, the claims are narrative in form and describe only the function of the apparatus without recitation of any structure to perform the recited function.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 8 and 9 appear to be claiming a natural phenomenon. Claim 7 claims increasing the gap along the path of the beam so that the strength of the field decreases. However, the amount the field decreases as a result of the increase in the gap is a natural phenomenon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,043,488 to Bahatt et al.

Bahatt discloses a magnetic separator for charged particle beam separation that provides a linear dispersion of the charged particles proportional to their mass-energy-to-charge ratio, wherein the linear dispersion is achieved by an inhomogeneous magnetic field (Col. 1, lines 67-Col. 2, line 9).



Application/Control Number: 10/052,891

Art Unit: 3653

In regard to claim 2, Bahatt discloses a second magnetic field in another plane (Col 2, lines 36+).

In regard to claim 4, Bahatt discloses a third magnetic field for re-collimating and directing the beam (Col. 3, lines 36+).

In regard to claims 6, 20 and 22, Bahatt discloses a plurality of magnetic fields though which pass charged particle beams.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahatt.

Bahatt discloses a magnetic or electrostatic field. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the magnetic or electrostatic field could be produced by methods known in the art.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahatt in view of US Patent No. 5,317,151 to Sinha et al.

Bahatt does not disclose a flux return yoke. However, high permeability yokes are known in the art for producing a high magnetic flux in the gap between poles (See e.g. US Patent

Art Unit: 3653

No. 5,317,151 to Sinha). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such a voke in Bahatt's device for that purpose.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Kohner whose telephone number is 703-305-8496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh can be reached on 703-306-4173. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew J. Kohner

Examiner Art Unit 3653

MJK

DONALD PATENT EXAMINER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600